

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE BROWN COUNTY
PLANNING, DEVELOPMENT & TRANSPORTATION COMMITTEE**

Pursuant to Section 19.84 Wis. Stats., a regular meeting of the **Brown County Planning, Development & Transportation Committee** was held on Monday, September 25, 2017 in Room 200, 305 E. Walnut St., Green Bay, WI

Present: Supervisors Bernie Erickson, Dave Kaster, Dave Landwehr, Norbert Dantine, Tom Sieber
Also Present: Supervisor Tom Lund, Planning Director Chuck Lamine, Port & Resource Recovery Director Dean Haen, Airport Director Tom Miller, Public Works Director Paul Fontecchio, Register of Deeds Cheryl Berken, Chief Deputy Register of Deeds Sara Frisque and other interested parties.

**Audio of the meeting is available by contacting the County Board office (920) 448-4015.*

I. Call Meeting to Order.

The meeting was called to order by Chair Bernie Erickson at 6:40 p.m.

II. Approve/Modify Agenda.

Motion made by Supervisor Kaster, seconded by Supervisor Landwehr to approve. Vote taken. MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY

III. Approve/Modify Minutes of August 28, 2017.

Motion made by Supervisor Kaster, seconded by Supervisor Dantine to approve. Vote taken. MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY

Comments from the Public

Mike Vande Hei – 2696 Lost Dauphin Rd., De Pere

Vande Hei informed they needed help; they tried talking to the Highway Department. On Oct 8, 2017 someone milled the road and they hadn't seen them since except for the dust. The only time they got water was if the county crews were working in the area. He believed this was air pollution and noted there was a DNR ruling 10.68 regarding dust control on highways construction projects. They had called the county numerous times and they will come through once a week. They got water today but the county water truck was going so fast through the watering lasted less than 5 minutes. They called the County Executive Sunday and haven't heard back. He told them they didn't have to come to this meeting and he would take care of it and he never got back to them. They could go right to the DNR because of the ruling on dust control and they could go to the Brown County Health Department because it was air pollution. He invited the committee to come sit in their front yards, CTH D. He believed the county guys were trying their hardest to get this thing done, they were supposed to be done Oct 1st and now they were hearing rumors that they may not get it done at all this year. He questioned why they had to rip up their road and make them live with the dust. Vande Hei stated they didn't want to threaten anyone but they were tired of it and because Streckenbach was supposed to get back to them today there were only 2 of them that could make the meeting but they could have 50-60 people here.

Larry Offer - 2676 Lost Dauphin Rd., De Pere

Offer stated they didn't have a summer because of the dust, they couldn't go outside or open windows and had a dust storm when they cut their grass and questioned what do they do? He questioned why their section was tore up when they really don't have anything done 100% on the other end? He had called Highway many times questioning where they were. There were 2 water trucks sitting at the other end. Vande Hei informed that they told that staff was not allowed in those water trucks unless they got approval from their Supervisors.

Landwehr stated he would attest to it, he was in the area last night and it was bad. Even the county equipment that was out there had a layer of dust on them. A key thing for the committee to understand, this roadway was done in three different segments and these gentlemen were in the last segment.

Public Works Director Paul Fontecchio stated he never met or talked with these gentlemen so somehow there was a breakdown in communication and he apologized for that. The reason they tore the asphalt off was they had some culvert pipes... Vande Hei interjected that they had the pavement cut and it was earlier this spring. Fontecchio wasn't trying to argue [Erickson interjected that it was Fontecchio's time to talk; Kaster stated they understood that they were frustrated] Fontecchio furthered, it's been a long summer. As noted in his report, the whole project was over budget and behind schedule. The weather had not helped them earlier this year. They were not excuses but it was the way it was. They were coming up their way very quickly. They had had water trucks out there. He again apologized for any miscommunication or misunderstandings but they were doing their best. They will get the road done this fall.

Landwehr brought this issue up over the last several months, comments about the dust and phone calls he had been getting and it's all in the minutes. He acknowledged that they will water on occasion when working out there but he had never heard of them watering on the weekends. Fontecchio stated that they could, he reiterated that for a lot of the summer it rained so water was the enemy but they will keep watering it.

Erickson stated this was the road they had issues on so it wasn't going as smoothly as it was supposed to anywhere. It was a small disaster that they didn't anticipate and they were trying to get this corrected, it was unfortunate. He questioned if they had a potential timeframe. Fontecchio responded they were working that way with undercutting and earthwork. They were currently paving on a DOT project. Next week they should be back on D committed full throttle for the rest of the year with paving. Erickson suggested they upped the water control.

Vande Hei stated their crew did a great job when they were working but they forgot about everyone else. He informed he called their office and talked to Rachel and it took 3 months to get a reply from her. He then went to Nick and the following day he heard from Rachel. They called the Highway so many times. They started to realize that they were only watering where they were working. They understood you can't have workers in that pollution but they were allowing them to be in that. Fontecchio guaranteed that they will redouble their efforts and asked that if they had anymore issues to call him directly.

1. **Review Minutes of:**
 - a. **Board of Adjustment (September 18, 2017).**
 - b. **Planning Commission Board of Directors (August 2, 2017).**
 - c. **Solid Waste Board (July 31, 2017 and August 28, 2017).**
 - d. **Transportation Coordinating Committee (September 11, 2017).**

Motion made by Supervisor Dantine, seconded by Supervisor Kaster to suspend the rules to take Items 1a-d together. Vote taken. MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY

Motion made by Supervisor Dantine, seconded by Supervisor Kaster to receive and place on file Items 1a-d. Vote taken. MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY

Advance Economic Development

2. **Quarterly Report from Advance Business – Peter Zaehring, Vice President, Economic Development.**

Motion made by Supervisor Landwehr, seconded by Supervisor Dantine to hold for the evening. Vote taken. MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY

Communications

3. **Communication from Supervisor Dantine re: To have Brown County Planning put together a report of what we should do with the land that the STEM Center is moved to at UWGB. *Referred from September County Board.***

Lamine informed Dantine was correct in that there was a decision to move the STEM building out to UW-Green Bay. It was in process but not a complete final deal as they had a land lease they had to work through but that was the direction they were working towards. UWGB's intention was to provide another 63 acres in order to put the research park property on that balance of land. Both were moving forward but there were a lot of steps to go through.

A brief discussion ensued with regard to the county owned property, Lamine felt a study should be done and brought back to this committee with some options.

Motion made by Supervisor Landwehr, seconded by Supervisor Dantine to have staff report back in January. Vote taken. MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY

Motion made by Supervisor Sieber, seconded by Supervisor Landwehr to suspend the rules to modify the agenda to take Item 5 before 4. Vote taken. MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY

4. **Communication from Supervisor Dantine re: To have Director Miller look into ways to consolidate airport services with other airports to give better service to travelers. *Referred from September County Board.***

Dantine questioned if it was possible to share services to have direct flights out of Green Bay? Airport Director Tom Miller stated as it stood right now you couldn't restrict an airline from operating to a destination in which they wanted to serve regardless of what airport they were coming from. A few years ago there was the Wright Amendment that restricted the stage length of what cities could be served out of Dallas Love Field out of Texas. That's when congress got involved and created those restrictions and then ultimately took those restrictions away where Dallas/Fort Worth had two major airports where you could fly to virtually any destination in the United States. He wasn't aware of any "agreement" between neighboring communities which would limit what destinations could be served from a particular airport. Decisions to serve nearby cities on different days of the week were made by the airline as opposed to by the airport. The covenants that they agreed to as sponsors for taking grant dollars from the Federal Aviation Administration for capital projects restrict them from limiting aeronautical services provided by an airline.

Sieber had heard people talk about the possibilities of consolidating Appleton and Brown County, combining them into a central location to become a regional powerhouse and asked if Miller had anything to say about it. Miller stated he had been here over 24 years and that discussion had been going on since he came to Green Bay. Philosophically it may make a little sense but realistically because of the infrastructure that had been built in both communities, in order to be able to build a central location, the effort to get that accomplished would cost a lot of money. Earlier this year he put together a brief cost estimate for the Executive and it was on the higher side of a half a billion dollars. While they continue to fight for their various market shares the financial cost of doing that was, in his opinion, prohibited.

Motion made by Supervisor Landwehr, seconded by Supervisor Dantine to receive and place on file. Vote taken. MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY

5. **Communication from Supervisor Clancy re: I request the Capital Improvement Plan be modified as follows: The 2021 CTH KB project at a cost of \$750,000 be moved to 2019; and the 2018 CTH PP project be modified with new project limits from School Lane to Shirley Road at a new cost of \$600,000; and the 2020 CTH PP project be modified with new project limits from Man-Cal Road to School Lane at a new cost of \$3,162,500. *Referred from September County Board.***

Supervisor Clancy was approach by Denmark Village Board and they stated this was the first time in years that they had the ability to do something great for the village but it all would come together if the county could facilitate with the building of a roundabout; a \$8-\$10 million dollar tax base. They would have a full size Kwik Trip, a hotel/motel built plus they were promised a commitment to have international softball played there. He talked to Weininger to see if this could be arranged through Public Works.

Fontecchio informed they were working with the Village of Denmark for a while to accommodate what they needed

to build an industrial type park area and that included building a roundabout. They had it in their 6-year CIP for 2021 but they wanted to move it up to 2019. Fontecchio explained it was trickier to move stuff around with the .5% sales tax but informed how he was able to shuffle things around to make it work. It was a \$0 impact to the 2018 budget.

Landwehr's stated the 3rd piece to this was making sure the other communities that this may affect were aware of it and okay with it.

Motion made by Supervisor Landwehr, seconded by Supervisor Sieber to approve. Vote taken. MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY

Register of Deeds

6. Budget Status Financial Report for August 2017.

Register of Deeds Cheryl Berken informed real estate was still going strong; interest rates were hiked in March and in June with vaulted the refi craze. As interest rates go up they decrease in mortgages and satisfactions.

Motion made by Supervisor Sieber, seconded by Supervisor Kaster to receive and place on file. Vote taken. MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY

7. 2018 Budget Worksheet / Revenue Report.

8. Brown County Remote Access Analysis.

9. Register of Deeds Rates and Fees.

Items 7, 8 and 9 were taken together.

Cheryl Berken provided handouts (attached) and informed this was where all the proposals would come in. In the past they added revenue by increasing the per-print fee but they never raised the monthly fees. They proposed a rate increase of their tiered customers. They had not raised those fees since 2003. Also Fidler, their real estate software vendor, fees were increasing on their tiered plans as noted on the budget worksheet. They had different plans, tiered plans and four customers that were grandfathered. At this point they don't pay Fidler for their grandfathered customers but those customers pay \$400 a month for the first line and \$120 for each additional lines. 2 of their customers had quite a few additional lines. When Fidler first started the previous Register of Deeds negotiated that the 4 grandfathered companies, because they were Brown County's customers, not get charged by Fidler.

As Fidler progressed they created this Tapestry program that would give them \$40,000 in revenue. In 2016 but they only received \$7,500 because the county was holding back the 4 grandfathered, they don't get as much revenue. Tapestry was a different program that users from the outside could go in and get copies. It was linked when you look at your tax bill, etc. and you can get a copy of your deed. It's charged more money to do that and they received revenue from it. She informed that by raising the fees on their tiered and if they gave back their grandfathered plans they would be paying Fidler the extra money but they would be getting the cost back from the Tapestry. So it increased their revenue by \$43,144. She informed Corporation Counsel had looked at their contracts and were rewriting them.

Sieber questioned why title companies had to come to them to get access to the program? Why don't they contract with Tapestry or Fidler? Chief Deputy Register of Deeds Sara Frisque informed because they were using the county's data. Every 5 years they had their maintenance agreement that came due and it usually went up a certain percentage every year and it had since 2003. They were looking at increasing their outside user fees as they had not increased since 2003. Berken stated that if they left everything the same, they had increased expenses without increased revenue.

Berken informed they had to give a 60 day notice to any changes they were going to make. Responding to Landwehr, Frisque informed that they could come again next year to split up the increase as he calculated it to be about a 40% increase.

Frisque surveyed all of the counties that ran the Laredo program because that's what every county would use as their outside service and asked them what their tiered plans were and Brown County, being as large as it was, they were one of the cheapest counties even considering the counties closest to us. It was a minimum of \$25-\$50 less. When they were looking at numbers they went in the medium. They would not be the highest and not the lowest but similar to what all the other counties around them were charging already. Almost every county, there were at least 6 or 7 that will be increasing their fees again in the 2018 budget so Brown County will be even further back fees wise. Berken added their yearly amount to Fidler for this lifecycle was \$59,000 and was going up to \$68,000 which was considerable.

Landwehr and Sieber felt it would be better to make increases in stages over the next couple of years verses all at once. Sieber felt anytime fees jumped 10%+ people came forward and he was worried that when they got to budget the budget meeting, all the title companies showed up to complain that they didn't receive any notice and they end up not doing anything because the full board can't make a decision. Berken and Frisque stated they could but it was a matter of doing contracts every year, they were auto renew. Gerbers stated the notices can go out a week after it's approved at the October County Board. Berken informed the way the contract read, this could start in February. Erickson stated they were just raising it to be workable.

Landwehr didn't feel comfortable raising fees just because they could. Frisque responded that they wanted to be comparable, they had to raise their rates this year, and if they didn't have to they would have left them where they were. They did this study just to see where everyone else was at. They didn't want to lose any customers out of this either. Landwehr questioned if companies had a choice, Berken and Frisque informed they could come in the office and do their searching for free and pay for their copies. There was a choice, it was just convenience.

**Motion made by Supervisor Dantine, seconded by Supervisor Erickson to approve as submitted. Vote taken.
Nay: Landwehr, Sieber. MOTION CARRIED 3 to 2**

Planning and Land Services

Land Information, Property Listing, Zoning – No agenda items.

Planning Commission

10. Southern Bridge Update.

Principal Planner Cole Runge informed this was a request by Landwehr. They had discussions about issues and misconceptions about the project. The Brown County Planning Commission had seen most of this and had been updated slightly since the meeting in September. Handouts were provided re: Answers to Frequently Asked Questions about the Southern Bridge Project in which he spoke to. They thought this would be a helpful thing for people to take a look at and distribute.

**Motion made by Supervisor Dantine, seconded by Supervisor Sieber to receive and place on file. Vote taken.
MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY**

Airport

11. Airport Departmental Opening Summary.

**Motion made by Supervisor Sieber, seconded by Supervisor Dantine to receive and place on file. Vote taken.
MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY**

UW-Extension

12. Budget Status Financial Report for July 2017.

**Motion made by Supervisor Dantine, seconded by Supervisor Landwehr to receive and place on file. Vote taken.
MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY**

13. Budget Adjustment Request (17-66): Any increase in expenses with an offsetting increase in revenue.

Motion made by Supervisor Dantine, seconded by Supervisor Landwehr to approve. Vote taken. MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY

14. Director's Report.

Motion made by Supervisor Landwehr, seconded by Supervisor Dantine to receive and place on file. Vote taken. MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY

Public Works

15. Resolution Providing One-Time Supplemental Compensation to: 1) Employees in the IBEW Local 158 Bargaining Unit; and 2) Employees in the Brown County Human Services Professional Employee Association.

Motion made by Supervisor Sieber, seconded by Supervisor Dantine to approve. Vote taken. MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY

16. Recommendation and Approval for Jail Ceiling Repairs – Project #2179.

Motion made by Supervisor Landwehr, seconded by Supervisor Sieber to approve HJ Martin and Sons for \$36,418. Vote taken. MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY

17. New Initiatives for Plowing Optimization. *Directive out of August meeting.*

Motion made by Supervisor Dantine, seconded by Supervisor Kaster to receive and place on file. Vote taken. MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY

18. Summary of Operations.

Motion made by Supervisor Sieber, seconded by Supervisor Kaster to receive and place on file. Vote taken. MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY

19. Director's Report.

Motion made by Supervisor Landwehr, seconded by Supervisor Dantine to receive and place on file. Vote taken. MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY

Port & Resource Recovery – No agenda items.

20. Resolution Authorizing the Purchase and Sale of Real Estate.

Motion made by Supervisor Landwehr, seconded by Supervisor Dantine to take Item 20 after Item 24. Vote taken. MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY See Item 24.

21. Director's Report.

Motion made by Supervisor Dantine, seconded by Supervisor Sieber to receive and place on file. Vote taken. MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY

Closed Session

22. Open Session: Motion and Recorded Vote pursuant to Wis. Stats. Sec. 19.85(1), regarding going into closed session pursuant to Wis. Stats. Sec. 19.85(1)(e), i.e. deliberating or negotiating the purchasing of public properties, the investing of public funds, or conducting other specified public business, whenever competitive or bargaining reasons require a closed session, in particular, deliberating and negotiating strategy and options regarding buying and selling property for landfill use.

Motion made by Supervisor Dantine, seconded by Supervisor Kaster to enter into closed session. Vote taken. MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY

23. **Convene into Closed Session: Pursuant to Wis. Stats. Sec. 19.85(1)(g), the Brown County PD&T Committee shall convene into closed session for purposes of deliberating or negotiating the purchasing of public properties, the investing of public funds, or conducting other specified public business, as competitive or bargaining reasons require a closed session here for deliberating and negotiating strategy and options regarding buying and selling property for landfill use.**
24. **Reconvene into Open Session: The Brown County PD&T Committee shall reconvene into open session for possible voting and/or other action regarding buying and selling property for landfill use.**

Motion made by Supervisor Sieber, seconded by Supervisor Dantine to approve the sale and move on to the Executive Committee. Vote taken. MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY

Other

25. **Acknowledging the bills.**

Motion made by Supervisor Sieber seconded by Supervisor Dantine to acknowledge the receipt of the bills. Vote taken. MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY

26. **Such other matters as authorized by law.**
27. **Adjourn.**

Motion made by Supervisor Dantine, seconded by Supervisor Kaster to adjourn at 9:26 pm. Vote taken. MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY

Respectfully submitted,

Alicia A. Loehlein,
Recording Secretary

Dust Control On Construction Sites (1068)

Wisconsin Department of Natural Resources
Conservation Practice Standard

I. Definition

Dust control includes practices used to reduce or prevent the surface and air transport of dust during construction.

Dust control measures for construction activities include minimization of soil disturbance, applying mulch and establishing vegetation, water spraying, surface roughening, applying polymers, spray-on tackifiers, chlorides, and barriers.

II. Purpose

This practice may be used to:

- Reduce wind erosion and dust.
- Minimize deposition of dust and wind transported soils into water bodies through runoff or wind action.
- Reduce respiratory problems.
- Minimize low visibility conditions caused by airborne dust.

III. Conditions Where Practice Applies

Dust control measures may be applied at any construction site, but is particularly important for sites with dry exposed soils which may be exposed to wind or vehicular traffic.

IV. Federal, State, and Local Laws

Users of this standard shall comply with applicable federal, state and local laws, rules, regulations or permit requirements governing this practice. This standard does not contain the text of federal, state, or local laws.

V. Criteria

This section establishes the minimum standards

for design, installation and performance requirements.

- A. The implementation of dust control shall limit the area exposed for dust generation.
- B. Asphalt and petroleum based products cannot be used for dust control.
- C. Mulch and Vegetation - Mulch or seed and mulch may be applied to protect exposed soil from both wind and water erosion. Refer to WDNR Conservation Practice Standards Mulching for Construction Sites (1058) and Seeding for Construction Site Erosion Control (1059) for criteria.
- D. Water - Water until the surface is wet and repeat as needed. Water shall be applied at rates so that runoff does not occur. Treated soil surfaces that receive vehicle traffic require a stone tracking pad or tire washing at all point of access. Refer to WDNR Conservation Practice Standard Stone Tracking Pad and Tire Washing (1057) for criteria.
- E. Tillage - A control measure performed with chisel type plows on exposed soils. Tillage shall begin on the windward side of the site. Tillage is only applicable to flat areas.
- F. Polymers - Polymers can be an effective practice for areas that do not receive vehicle traffic. Dry applied polymers must be initially watered for activation to be effective for dust control. Refer to WDNR Conservation Practice Standard Erosion Control Land Application of Polymers (1050) for application criteria.
- G. Tackifiers and Soil Stabilizers Type A - Products must be selected from and installed at rates conforming to the WisDOT Erosion Control PAL. See Section IX for reference. Example products include Latex-based and

Guar Gum.

- H. Chlorides - Chlorides shall be applied according to the most recent version of the WisDOT Standard Specifications for Highway and Bridge Construction.
- I. Barriers - Barriers shall be placed at right angles to prevailing wind currents at intervals of about 15 times the barrier height. Solid board fences, snow fences, burlap fences, crate walls, bales of hay and similar material can be used to control air currents and blown soil.

VI. Considerations

Some sites may require an approach that utilizes a combination of measures for dust control.

VII. Plans and Specifications

Plans and specifications for dust control practices shall be in keeping with this standard and shall describe the requirements for applying the practice to achieve its intended purpose.

VIII. Operation and Maintenance

Areas that have dust control practices shall at a minimum be inspected daily.

IX. References

WisDOT's Erosion Control Product Acceptability List (PAL) can be found on the WisDOT web site:
<http://www.dot.wisconsin.gov/business/engrserv/pal.htm> Printed copies are no longer being distributed.

Tiered Plans

Current Register of Deeds Pricing Plan since 2003					Register of Deeds Pricing Plan Increase					
Plan	# of users	Price per user	Total per Month	Total Collected Per year		Plan	# of users	Price per user	Total per Month	Total Collected Per year
A	24	\$75.00	\$1,800.00	\$21,600.00		A	24	\$125.00	\$3,000.00	\$36,000.00
B	5	\$125.00	\$625.00	\$7,500.00		B	5	\$175.00	\$875.00	\$10,500.00
C	2	\$195.00	\$390.00	\$4,680.00		C	2	\$225.00	\$450.00	\$5,400.00
D	1	\$295.00	\$295.00	\$3,540.00		D	1	\$350.00	\$350.00	\$4,200.00
E	6	\$400.00	\$2,400.00	\$28,800.00		E	6	\$500.00	\$3,000.00	\$36,000.00
				\$66,120.00						\$92,100.00
Current Fidlar Pricing Plan					Fidlar Pricing Plan Increase					
Plan	# of users	Fidlar Charge Price per user	Total per Month	Total Paid to Fidlar Per year		Plan	# of users	Fidlar Charge Price per user	Total per Month	Total Paid to Fidlar Per year
A	24	\$40.00	\$960.00	\$11,520.00		A	24	\$45.00	\$1,080.00	\$12,960.00
B	5	\$55.00	\$275.00	\$3,300.00		B	5	\$65.00	\$325.00	\$3,900.00
C	2	\$75.00	\$150.00	\$1,800.00		C	2	\$85.00	\$170.00	\$2,040.00
D	1	\$83.00	\$83.00	\$996.00		D	1	\$103.00	\$103.00	\$1,236.00
E	6	\$95.00	\$570.00	\$6,840.00		E	6	\$115.00	\$690.00	\$8,280.00
				\$24,456.00						\$28,416.00
Total Collected per year			\$66,120.00	\$92,100.00						
Total Paid to Fidlar per year			\$24,456.00	\$28,416.00						
Total Revenue collected by ROD			\$41,664.00	\$64,896.00						
				\$23,232						

Current Grandfathered Plan

Company Name	Type of Plan	Original Site	Monthly Fee	# Add'l Sites	Add'l site monthly fee	Total Monthly Fees	Total per Year
Bay Title	unlimited	1	\$400.00	4	\$125.00	\$900.00	\$10,800.00
First American Title-Evans	unlimited	1	\$400.00	8	\$125.00	\$1,400.00	\$16,800.00
Liberty Title	unlimited	1	\$400.00	1	\$125.00	\$525.00	\$6,300.00
Lighthouse Group	unlimited	1	\$400.00	1	\$125.00	\$525.00	\$6,300.00
						<u>\$3,350.00</u>	<u>\$40,200.00</u>

We do not pay Fidar each year due to the Grandfather Claus

New Grandfathered Plan (Limiting Sites to 3)

Company Name	Type of Plan	Original Sites	Monthly Fee	#Add'l Sites	Add'l monthly fee	ABS Book 5 yr plan	Total Monthly Fees	Total Per Year
Bay Title	Unlimited	1	\$400.00	2	\$125.00	\$0.00	\$650.00	\$7,800.00
First American Title-Evans	Unlimited	1	\$400.00	2	\$125.00	\$0.00	\$650.00	\$7,800.00
Liberty Title	Unlimited	1	\$400.00	1	\$125.00	\$0.00	\$525.00	\$6,300.00
Lighthouse Grp	Unlimited	1	\$400.00	1	\$125.00	\$54.00	\$579.00	\$6,948.00
							<u>\$2,404.00</u>	<u>\$28,848.00</u>

We would pay fidlar each year under the Standard Plan

Current Plan	\$40,200.00
New Plan	-\$28,848.00
Difference =	<u>\$11,352.00</u>

Laredo Proposal	\$49,940.00
Plan adjustment	-\$11,352.00
	<u>\$38,588.00 (what we would budget for Laredo)</u>

Answers to Frequently Asked Questions about the Southern Bridge Project

Brown County Planning Commission
September 2017

Q: Which Southern Bridge project locations are still being studied?

A: The two project locations that are currently being studied are at Scheuring and Heritage Roads and at Rockland and Red Maple/Southbridge Roads in De Pere.

Q: When will the Southern Bridge project's location be identified?

A: The project's location will be officially identified after the project's Final Environmental Impact Statement (FEIS) is approved by the Wisconsin Department of Transportation and Federal Highway Administration and a Record of Decision (ROD) is signed by the Federal Highway Administration. These approvals are currently planned to be received by the end of 2018.

Q: What work has to be completed before the Southern Bridge project can be constructed?

A: A summary of the work that has to be completed is attached at the end of this paper.

Q: Can a new Interstate 41 interchange be built at Southbridge Road?

A: This will be determined by the results of an Interstate Access Justification Report (IAJR) that is currently being prepared by Brown County in conjunction with the Wisconsin Department of Transportation and Federal Highway Administration.

Q: Why does an Interstate Access Justification Report (IAJR) have to be prepared for this project?

A: An Interstate Access Justification Report (IAJR) must be prepared to evaluate how a new interchange will affect safety and traffic flow along Interstate 41 and at the existing interchanges at Scheuring Road and Freedom Road.

Q: When will the Interstate Access Justification Report (IAJR) be finished?

A: The Interstate Access Justification Report (IAJR) is currently planned to be completed by the end of 2018.

Q: Is Southbridge Road too close to the existing Scheuring Road interchange to allow a new interchange to be constructed at Southbridge Road?

A: No. A new interchange at Southbridge Road would be far enough away from the Scheuring Road interchange. Southbridge Road's distance from Scheuring Road will not be a factor when determining if a new interchange can be constructed.

Q: Will the new Southern Bridge and connecting streets be designed as a freeway like State Highway 172 or Interstates 41 and 43?

A: No. Regardless of the location, the new Southern Bridge and connecting streets will not be designed as a freeway. Instead, the new Southern Bridge's design is planned to resemble the Claude Allouez Bridge in Downtown De Pere (four driving lanes, bicycle facilities, and pedestrian walkways), and the connecting street segments will resemble County Highway GV in Ledgeview and Bellevue and South Huron Road on the east side of Green Bay (four driving lanes, bicycle and pedestrian facilities, and a grass median).

Q: Will Brown County try to get money from the federal government to help pay for the project?

A: Yes. One of the reasons that the Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) is being completed is to enable Brown County to be eligible for federal money to construct the Southern Bridge, the streets that connect to the bridge, and a new interchange at Interstate 41 (if this interchange is approved by the Federal Highway Administration).

Q: What portion of the Southern Bridge project's construction costs can be funded with money from the federal government?

A: Federal money can cover up to 80 percent of the costs associated with building the new Southern Bridge, the streets that connect to the bridge, and an interchange at Interstate 41 (if this interchange is approved by the Federal Highway Administration). However, the actual federal contribution has not yet been determined.

Q: Who should I contact for information about the Southern Bridge project?

A: Please contact:

Cole Runge, Principal Planner
Brown County Planning Commission

Phone: (920) 448-6480

Email: runge_cm@co.brown.wi.us

Southern Bridge Project Development Process (As of September 2017)

Abbreviations:

WisDOT = Wisconsin Department of Transportation

FHWA = Federal Highway Administration

EIS = Environmental Impact Statement

IAJR = Interstate Access Justification Report

